



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

VOLUME XXVII

MAY 1922

NUMBDR 6

THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE

CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Increasing immensity of the public service. New York and federal figures. Increases during past decade. Totals for federal, state, and local governments. President Harding's attitude on need for reduction and rearrangement. Secretary Hoover's illustration of need for co-ordination. Conditions revealed by study and investigations by sundry bodies. Recommendations of National Chamber of Commerce and of Federation of Federal Employees. Reclassification in Congress. Compensation problems. Changes in attitude toward the public service. The probationary period and its significance. Women in the public service.

Unquestionably the most impressive phase of the present status of the public service is its *increasing immensity*. Whether we view the problem from the federal, the state, or the municipal viewpoint we are confronted with the fact that the number of offices is constantly increasing and that their functions are increasing in complexity and importance. Whether we like it or not, government bulks ever larger in our daily lives.

One of the most striking features of the recent admirable report of the New York Civil Service Commission is its endeavor to indicate with some exactness the extent of the entire civil service employment within that state. The combined figures follow.

	Employees	Compensation
State, county, and village service.....	36,325	\$ 42,803,885.03
City service.....	122,911	126,152,010.83
School teachers.....	58,850	63,800,000.00
Federal service.....	68,373	87,865,000.00
Total within New York State.....	286,459	\$320,620,895.86

These are the figures for one state—the largest one it is true—but conservatively speaking they certainly represent one-tenth of the entire civil service within the United States. Such an estimate would indicate that if all civil employees in the United States were marshaled in one great body, in numbers they would equal considerably more than the entire military force of the United States serving abroad during the world-war. Truly a formidable army of men and women, and when we stop to consider that not only the protection of our lives and property is in their charge, but likewise to a great extent the welfare and happiness of the American people, then we begin to appreciate how important, how supremely important, is the public service.

Some idea of the extent of the federal service may be gained from the figures (given in the table on p. 707) gathered by the Federal Civil Service Commission of the number of employees in the various branches. They are illuminating because they cover two periods, June 30, 1916, before America entered upon the world-war, and December 31, 1920, two years after the Armistice.

These figures cover the positions in the classified service and those outside, including unskilled laborers. The commission also adds the totals for November 11, 1918 (Armistice Day), and July 31, 1920. In November, 1918, the total in the District of Columbia was 117,760, and outside, 800,000, or a grand total of 917,760. The figures on July 31, 1920, were 90,559 inside the District and 600,557 outside, or a grand total of 691,116.

The very latest figures as to the number of employees in the federal government are those just published by the commission headed by Walter Brown for the purpose of reorganizing the federal departments. The total number of federal employees is given as 740,000, including 300,000 from the post-office and 245,000 from

the army and navy. Those employed in the District of Columbia now number 83,597. On January 1 last there were 86,452 in

DEPARTMENT OR OFFICE	JUNE 30, 1916			DEC. 31, 1920		
	In District of Columbia	Outside District of Columbia	Total	In District of Columbia	Outside District of Columbia	Total
The White House.....	39		39	48		48
Department of State*.....	283		283	602	2,393	3,085
Department of the Treasury.....	8,269	22,360	30,629	30,799	45,000	75,799
Department of War.....	2,266	31,674	33,940	10,162	88,368	98,530
Department of Justice†.....	1,449	2,796	4,245	722	2,907	3,629
Post-Office Department‡.....	1,582	249,303	250,885	3,483	278,011	281,494
Department of the Navy.....	5,046	30,676	35,722	10,860	74,964	85,824
Department of the Interior§.....	6,075	17,793	23,868	5,752	11,649	17,401
Department of Agriculture.....	4,670	14,066	18,736	4,586	13,907	18,493
Department of Commerce 	2,990	11,348	14,338	4,925	8,929	13,854
Department of Labor 				1,163	2,892	4,055
Government Printing Office.....	4,028		4,028	4,488		4,488
Smithsonian Institution.....	784		784	438		438
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	928	1,315	2,243	1,166	1,026	2,192
Civil Service Commission.....	215	35	250	368	21	389
Bureau of Efficiency.....	27		27	58		58
Federal Trade Commission.....	238		238	316		316
Shipping Board¶.....				2,488	6,986	9,474
Railroad Administration.....				1,148	116	1,264
Council of National Defense.....				42		42
War Trade Board.....				13		13
Alien Property Custodian.....				178	3	181
Tariff Commission.....				96		96
Employees' Compensation Commission.....				77		77
Federal Board for Vocational Education.....				860	3,223	4,083
The Panama Canal.....	153	19,173	19,326	111	12,922	13,033
Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board.....				40	158	198
Superintendence, State, W. & N. Buildings.....	217		217	1,511		1,511
Miscellaneous boards and commissions**.....				150	50	200
Totals.....	39,259	400,539	439,798	86,650	553,525	640,175

* Diplomatic and consular services included in 1920 but not in 1916.

† Number for District of Columbia, 1916, includes 23 commissioners of deeds, 800 notaries public, and 16 trustees of reform school, which are not included in number for 1920.

‡ Washington City Post-Office included in number for District of Columbia in 1920, but in "outside District of Columbia" in 1916.

§ Number for outside District of Columbia, 1916, includes 4,521 pension examining surgeons. Not included in number for 1920.

|| It was not found practicable to separate the employees of the Department of Labor from those of the Department of Commerce in 1916.

¶ Including administrative offices of Emergency Fleet Corporation but not workmen at shipyards under the corporation or employees on merchant vessels.

** Estimated for 1920. Not considered for 1916.

Washington, which number was reduced 3,000 by June 1. It is interesting to have the number of civilian employees in the army and navy departments: In the former there are 8,538 and in the latter 10,627. These figures, which have just been published, are later than those reported by the Civil Service Commission, and considered reasonably reliable.

There is an abundance of food for thought in these data, but we will have to forego it for the present at least, although it is interesting to note in passing that the high-water mark was recorded at the time of the Armistice and that at the peak according to the *Wall Street Journal* there was one civilian employee for every 136 inhabitants in the country.

Some further idea of the growth of the federal service is to be gathered from a consideration of the totals of earlier years:

1910.....	384,088
1911.....	391,350
1912.....	395,460
1913.....	469,879
1914.....	482,721
1915.....	476,363
1916.....	480,327
1917.....	517,805

Figures for the state and county services are only generally approximate. The most recent ones for this branch and for the municipal services according to William E. Mosher of the National Institute of Public Administration are those compiled by the National Bureau of Economics and are based on the returns for 1918:

School employees.....	724,500
Police.....	69,900
Fire.....	43,660
Municipal public service.....	38,830
Other employees.....	237,800

These figures compare favorably with the estimates of J. L. Jacobs, the Chicago engineer, who stated that there were probably 1,880,000 to 1,980,000 civil servants in the country in 1917, including the federal employees.

For 1918 the federal employees, according to Dr. King of the National Bureau of Economics, included:

Civil employees.....	433,000
Army.....	2,500,832
Navy.....	470,600
Marine corps.....	66,300
Post-office.....	290,000

An outstanding feature of the public service today is the fact that (largely as the result of the war, but partly also because of accumulated laxness of successive administrations) there is nearly an entire lack of proper and effective co-ordination of the service. Certain branches are overmanned, others badly undermanned, because of fluctuations and variations of functions. *It may be said to be a truism in the public service that it is easier to create ninety-nine new places than to have a needless one abolished.*

No one more keenly appreciates the federal situation than President Harding and his Cabinet. In his New York speech of May 23, 1921, he declared:

To bring economy and efficiency into government is a task second to none in difficulty. Few people, in or out of the government, have any conception of the growth of government business in the last decades before the world-war; still fewer at all realize the pace to which the growth has been speeded up since the war started. The multiplication of departments, bureaus, divisions, functions, has resulted in a sort of geometrical increase in the task which confronts the heads of executive departments when they face reconstruction problems.

Fortunately, the prospect is not so hopeless as might appear, because the present organization is so bad that the insistent application of a few established principles of sound business organization will result in immediate economics and provide a margin of available means to meet new demands. The party in power is pledged to economy and efficiency and you may be assured that every energy is being directed to redeem that pledge to the last degree and with all promptness. At the beginning of his administration President Taft secured from Congress the establishment of an economy and efficiency commission. It made a comprehensive survey of activities, organization and personnel of the whole Government establishment. The report on that survey was printed, but I believe never made public. But it is available, and can be consulted to determine where wastages and overlappings of function are.

A splendid beginning toward real co-ordination has been made in the passage of the Budget Law and the appointment of General

Dawes as Budget Director. Another auspicious event was the prompt removal of a bureau chief who was discovered to be "stalling" the President's plans. A few more such examples and the baleful influences of the Washington bureaucracy will be seriously curtailed if not largely offset.

Herbert Hoover gave a striking illustration of the need of co-ordination in his address at the Engineers' Club of Philadelphia. He said:

I have daily evidence in the Department of Commerce of all these forces. The question of governmental aids to navigation is not particularly a great question in governmental functions, but at least it is a trial to the hearty mariner. He must obtain his domestic charts from the Department of Commerce. His foreign charts he obtains from the Navy Department. His nautical almanac he gets from the National Observatory, and he will, in certain circumstances, obtain his sailing directions from the Army. In a fog he will get radio signals both from the Navy and the Department of Commerce. He will listen to fog horns and look for lights and buoys provided him by the Department of Commerce; and if his ship sinks, his life will be saved by the Treasury. He will anchor at the direction of the Army but he may rely on the Treasury to enforce their will. His boilers and life boats are inspected by the Department of Commerce; his crew certificated by one member on Commerce, signed off in the presence of another, inspected at sailing by the Treasury, and on arrival by the Department of Labor. In fact, he has relations with three other departments. In certain circumstances he is related to the Department of State and also has a relationship with the Department of Agriculture. There was a bill in Congress last session, which if it had passed, would have brought him within the last department that had neglected him. That was the Department of the Interior.

President Harding's observations and those of Secretary Hoover apply with equal force to all branches of government, federal, state, and municipal, and it is to be hoped that the President's policy will be closely followed by governors and mayors throughout the land for the need for economy and efficiency is everywhere most urgent. To date, the movement has made greater headway in the states, notably in the case of Illinois under the administration and leadership of Governor Lowden, than in the cities, but it is bound to come and the mayor who first establishes his administration upon a basis of scientific co-ordination and classification will make for himself a high place in the history of municipal regeneration and advance.

As one result of the situation described by President Harding we find according to the National Federation of Federal Employees that the official records of the United States Civil Service Commission, the Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification, and other similar agencies, reveal conditions such as these:

About 50,000 men and women employed by the government at less than a living wage.

As many as 10 or 12 different rates of pay for the same work.

Scientists and highly trained workers of many callings paid less than common laborers.

No future for employees appointed on merit, because the best positions are filled by political appointees.

A 40 per cent turnover in the government service, at a cost of millions of dollars to the government.

We need spend no time trying to find out which of these several conditions is the more likely to break down sound public service. No citizen concerned about the welfare of his community wants the service to be thus jeopardized. No taxpayer wants to see his money continuously put into an old and worn-out machine; and certainly no truly interested employee wants to continue to work under the inequalities, injustices, and disheartening conditions that now exist.

Fortunately two great national bodies are devoting a large measure of time and attention to the solution of these phases of the present unsatisfactory status of the public service, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the National Federation of Federal Employees representing respectively the employer and the employed.

Adequate and equitable pay for the army of government employees is strongly urged by the chamber's Committee on Budget and Efficiency as one of a series of proposals for a complete recasting of the federal civil service. Its report was sent out to a referendum vote of the industrial and commercial organizations within the chamber's membership. It presents nine recommendations dealing with reclassification of personnel and related problems. The purpose was to ascertain the opinion of business organizations respecting the recommendations made by the committee. The propositions voted on were:

I. The present system under which personnel for the federal civil service is secured and managed should be recast. The vote was 1,695 for and 23 against.

II. Adequate and uniform pay under essentially like conditions should be established as a fundamental principle for the federal service through reclassification and regrading. Vote: 1,652½ to 43½.

III. Reclassification should be by statute based on investigations already made and further investigation by the Civil Service Commission. Vote: 1,562 to 108.

IV. Reclassification should be installed by the commission and the Budget Bureau and the current correction made by Congress aided by these agencies. Vote: 1,610 to 69.

V. Promotion should be given statutory recognition as the preferred method for filling vacancies, with lines of promotion clearly defined and promotions made upon the basis of proved merit under civil service regulations. Vote: 1,649 to 39.

VI. All administrative officers not responsible for determining policies should be included under civil service rules. Vote: 1,544 to 135.

VII. Transfers between departments should be regulated by executive orders consistent with the civil service law. Vote: 1,680 to 13.

VIII. Efficiency records should be developed by the Civil Service Commission. Vote: 1,653 to 48.

IX. Removal of an employee should be possible upon a written statement of reasons to the employee with opportunity for written reply, but without right of appeal above the head of the department. Vote: 1,481½ to 173½.

These propositions represent the underlying principles of a sound policy of public-service employment and their more general observance in the various branches of government would represent a great step toward truly efficient and economical administration of public affairs.

In support of its recommendations the chamber's committee urged that

the personnel problem of an enterprise which engages the services of more than half a million employes cannot be minimized, if the public which foots the bills

in ever increasing amounts for government costs is ever to receive a reasonable return on its investment. Recent developments make it not only opportune but imperative that business now give this matter the thoughtful consideration which it deserves.

It is most significant that this report should declare, as it did with strong emphasis that

in private industrial and commercial life, the innumerable questions relating to the efficient utilization of the operating and managing forces of the organization are now accepted as of vital importance to successful management of the business. In this field of administration of the public business government has lagged far behind. With the passage of time the statute books have become filled with a mass of varying directory or prohibitory decisions of Congress which today seriously hamper any successful handling of recognized problems of admittedly primary importance in establishing a businesslike administration of the federal service.

It is equally important and significant that the recommendations should be so overwhelmingly approved by the constituent members scattered all over the country and representing every section.

With reference to its recommendation that adequate and uniform pay under like conditions should be established the committee maintained that

it is an elementary proposition that a body of employees permeated with a sense of unjust and inequitable treatment by the employer in the primary matter of just pay for services rendered will be inefficient and expensive. Present conditions in the federal service as to fixation of salary rates are perpetual incitements to discontent and half-hearted effort and an undoubted source of great waste of public money.

An important recommendation of the committee was the one having to do with inclusion within the civil service of administrative officers not charged with determining matters of policy. With respect to this suggestion the committee said:

One of the most serious handicaps to both economy and efficiency in the federal service is undoubtedly to be found in the practical exclusion from the permanent civil service of a very large part, if not practically all, of the administrative offices of real distinction. No one would suggest that Cabinet officers and their immediate assistants should be other than the personal selection of the President or of themselves, and permanency in the highest positions in the foreign service of the Department of State, such as ambassadors and ministers, probably will have to come as a matter of practice rather than law or executive rule. There still remain, however, a very large number of positions which

belong properly with the permanent operating force of the government and should be so recognized. These include principally such local offices as postmasters of the first, second and third classes. Appointments to these offices continue to be made almost without exception on the basis of political favor. Each change in administration, particularly if it involves a change in party, means a wholesale overturn in this personnel. This waste is tremendous and obvious.

President Harding's recent executive order concerning postmasters is in direct line with the chamber's thought. Already a beginning has been made under an administration that was not regarded as so friendly to the Merit System as some of its predecessors. According to Mark Sullivan, since President Wilson's order on the subject, excluding the eleven southern states, out of a total of 1,592 postmasters appointed, 598 were Democrats and 846 were Republicans. In Massachusetts 20 out of 28 appointees were Republicans.

It is interesting to note what legislation the National Federation of Federal Employees is asking Congress to exact. It covers the following main points:

1. Reclassification of all positions in the civil service, everywhere throughout the United States.
2. A salary scale which fixes pay by the skill and training required for the work, with a minimum rate of not less than the cost of living as determined by official investigations.
3. Appointments and promotions on proved qualification, determined and regulated by the Federal Civil Service Commission.
4. Removal of inefficient employees in accordance with standards of efficiency, controlled by the Civil Service Commission.
5. Opportunity for advancement of pay within a grade, according to efficiency.
6. Equal compensation and equal opportunity for promotion irrespective of sex.
7. A uniform efficiency rating system, to be established by the Civil Service Commission, with records accessible to employees and provision for appeal to the commission.
8. Transfers between departments at higher rates of pay.
9. Administration of the salary provisions by a central agency, which can keep the classifications up to date.

How significant that these two bodies agree so closely not only with each other, but with those who have been contending so faithfully for the Merit System so many years. If any argument were needed as to the general soundness of their contention that merit and fitness should be the basis of appointment, we have it in the vast army of employees involved and the importance of their duties and that those most concerned, employers, employees, and the public alike, agree substantially on the essential principle. When it comes to putting some of these principles into effect a greater difference of opinion becomes manifest. The reclassification hearings at Washington are at an end and the burning question now is what sort of bill will be evolved by the Civil Service committees of the two houses from their conferences. It is confidently believed by the federal employees that the joint measure will include the best features of the Sterling-Lehlbach bills, among these the Federal Wage Board with employee representation thereon.

Hearings on the several reclassification measures which have been carried on since May 17 by the Committees on Civil Service of the Senate and House, in joint session, with Senator Sterling presiding, came to an end June 15. The closing session was given over for the greater part to taking the testimony of a witness who is thoroughly conversant with the intricacies of reclassification—E. O. Griffenhagen, of Chicago, formerly consulting engineer for the Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification.

In Mr. Griffenhagen's judgment the Wood bill, the House counterpart of the Smoot measure, is only an appraisement and not a reclassification. A reclassification measure should be a regrouping with regard to duties, whereas the Wood bill groups positions according to their money value without any relation whatever to their duties. The looseness of description and the failure to provide for adequate grades were bad enough to start with, he said, but the present confusion would be still further increased by the administration of the Smoot-Wood proposals, because these bills leave further administration principally in the hands of the department heads. These officials would have different views as to allocation, and a different system would be adopted in each depart-

ment. "There must," he said, "be a central classifying agency. If left to the department heads you will have as many brands of allocation as you have departments. The Wood bill provides no plan or machinery for salary adjustments or reductions within grades. It offers no prospect of fundamental improvement in employment conditions."

Compensation is another phase of the present status of the public service crying aloud for attention. "Adequate and uniform pay," is the first plank of the Chamber of Commerce. "Equal pay for equal work," is the basis of the Philadelphia commission's report on classification prepared by the Griffenhagen Associates. In the words of the report of the chamber, "it is an elementary proposition that a body of employees permeated with a sense of unjust and inequitable treatment by the employer in the primary matter of just pay for services rendered will be inefficient and expensive. Present conditions in the federal service as to fixation of salary rates are a perpetual incitement to discontent and half-hearted effort, and an undoubted source of great waste of public money." The same is true of every state and municipal service and if we are to get a hundred cents' value for every dollar expended the government must show that it values service at 100 per cent.

Times change and conditions improve, although some of us who are close to the machinery are more apt to see the revolution of the wheels rather than the product of the energy produced.

If one were disposed to feel that there had been no progress, no development in the prosecution and development of the public service, let him read Sir Algernon West's *Contemporary Portraits*. He declares that he was not quite sure that he did not enter the British public service at one of its worse periods when the clerks really deserved the jokes leveled at their heads. Rumor gives one of them, probably unfairly, to the credit of Sir Thomas Farrer: "Why are government clerks like the fountains in Trafalgar Square?—Because they play all day from 10 to 4." Or take Charles Lamb's description of his day's work at the East India House, where the clerks who presented themselves before 10 were given their breakfasts:

From ten to eleven
 Eat breakfast for seven;
 From eleven to noon
 Think I'd come too soon;
 From noon till one
 Think what's to be done;
 From one to two
 Find nothing to do;
 From two to three
 Think it'll be
 A very great bore
 To stay till four.

Punch also was severe: "Clerk in government office, being offered a cup of coffee after lunch, declines with horror—'My dear fellow, it will keep me awake all the afternoon.'"

"What are your holidays?"

"Oh, ah, every day from 10 to 4 and all day Sunday."

The Owl, a paper edited by Evelyn Ashley, who was Lord Palmerston's secretary, Drummond Wolff, Lord Wharnccliffe, and others, gave this "advice to a young clerk by an old one." It said:

Avoid the reputation of writing quickly, otherwise the longest thing will be given you to copy, and you will be left working while your colleagues go to dinner. Establish on your first arrival the reputation of coming late; if punctual at first you will find it difficult to correct so pernicious a habit.

Recollect that a clerk worthy of the name obtains three leaves annually—regular leave, extra leave, sick leave, and so on. Remember how Dickens talked of the young man's office day, in which he stepped out a good deal and stepped back very little. Call your chief by his Christian name—or nickname—if shortsighted, call him Buz; if lame, Hoppy is not inappropriate.

When in the admiralty, Sir Algernon says he had made friends with Frederick Locker, who in those youthful days was very original and entertaining. He always wore gloves while performing his clerical duties, for fear, he said, he should soil his hands and have to ring the bell and send for the chief clerk if he wanted a clean towel or a fresh piece of soap. In later life he delighted the world with his brilliant verses and cheery "confidences."

Sir Algernon also has an entertaining story of manners at the Foreign Office, where in Victorian days the staff were not precisians.

A ukase had to be issued, "Clerks are not to walk about the passages in their shirt sleeves," but this was often disobeyed.

On a broiling day the chairman's private secretary came into the board-room in his shirt sleeves. Montgomery, in his fascinating little stammer, called him back as he was leaving the room, saying, "Mr. —, should it be any convenience to you to come in without your trousers, pray do not let any consideration for the board prevent your doing so."

Lord Welby, a Treasury official, was notorious for the chaos of his table. At the time of the Wainwright murder, when the poor victim's limbs were cut up and distributed, a cynical colleague was heard to say, "What a fool the murderer was—if he had put the body on Welby's table it would never have been discovered."

No one can seriously contend for a moment that conditions even remotely similar to these now exist in the American public service. Here and there perchance one may find an exception, but by and large the great mass of public employees, and I speak from long-time observation, are hard working, even where grossly underpaid.

There is one phase of the problem of efficiency we must not overlook, and that is the failure of the appointing officer to exercise his power of removal. During the probationary period that power is unrestricted and unrestrained. And yet how seldom is it used! In the wise and courageous words of the New York commission,

an administrative head who retains a competitive appointee in office beyond the three months' probationary period acknowledges by that retention the fitness of such appointee. A civil service commission has a brief time in which to ascertain the qualifications of an applicant for appointment, while supervision by the officer under whom the appointee serves, constituting a performance of duty examination which specifically extends through the probationary period, and thereafter as long as the employee remains under the officer. It is then laxity of administration or inefficiency on the part of the head of an office, or his unwillingness to act, rather than the merit system which is responsible for retaining an incompetent employee.

Even after the probationary period has passed, there is ample opportunity for the real executive, who is therefore the courageous executive, to rid himself of incompetents. The real truth of the matter, except where politics are involved, is that the average bureau head is timid or mistakenly kindhearted or more interested in the bureaucracy than in the public service and so asks for an additional

clerk rather than rid himself of a poor one. Courage should be a part of the equipment of every public administration.

Women are an important phase of the present status of the public service. The records of the Federal Civil Service Commission show that an increasing number of them are being appointed in the government service to positions which require technical or scientific training. Opportunities for women in such positions the commission points out would be increased if a larger proportion of those who attend the colleges and universities pursued technical and scientific courses. The commission opens *all* of its examinations to women; but the heads of departments have the legal right to specify the sex desired when they request a certification of eligibles and they exercise that right. It is true that for the higher places they are still likely to choose men, unless some woman in the office in which the vacancy exists has proved herself so valuable that she has attracted the attention of her chief and is promoted. Mrs. Gardener, a Federal Civil Service Commissioner, said:

I have long lists sent in by the Departments of women holding executive positions. Some claim that the higher opportunities never happen to be open to women. But they are open. For example, five women were appointed in 1920 to the examining corps of the United States Patent Office. The examination for this position is one of unusual difficulty, for it is intended to be such that only graduates of a high-grade technical school can pass it.

The five women appointees were chosen from seven who passed the examination in a class of twenty-four women applicants. During the same year seventy men passed the examination, and sixty-one of them were appointed. Only eighteen of the male applicants failed to pass, for the character of the test is well known and the examination is not undertaken by men who have not received the training demanded.

Women are citizens—they have been that, lo! these many days. They are now *voting citizens*. Moreover, they are achieving economic and industrial independence and they will compete to an increasing degree with men. The federal commission has very wisely issued a letter in which it says:

The purpose of this communication is to suggest the advisability of recommending to women students in preparatory schools and in colleges the advantage of pursuing technical and scientific courses rather than the purely

academic courses. The Commission believes that the changing conditions are not peculiar to the Government service, but are found in private employ as well; that the war experience of employers generally has had the effect of removing in considerable measure any prejudice which may have existed against the employment of women for technical and scientific work.

There is no question about the intelligence and loyalty of women. They are persistent and careful and unless men look to their laurels (if they still wear them) they will soon be displaced by women in many branches of the public service.

There are other phases of the present status of the public service including Postmaster General Hays's ambition "to humanize the post office," but I feel I have already overstepped the bounds of a reasonable patience—so I will stop with the query of my long-time friend and co-worker, Colonel William Gorham Rice: "Does any other subject warrant greater attention from the individual citizen and the individual taxpayer of the state than that of the operation of the civil service as a whole upon the basis laid down in the New York constitution—that of merit and fitness?"